UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------|---|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/052,577 | 01/18/2002 | Brent Magouirk | P68364 | 7360 |
| | 7590 06/22/200 Associates , LLC | EXAMINER | | |
| 2845 Duke Stre | et | LOFTIS, JOHNNA RONEE | | |
| Alexandria, VA 22314 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3624 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/22/2009 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@hershkovitz.net patent@hershkovitz.net

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/052,577 | MAGOUIRK ET AL. | |
| | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |

| | JOHNNA R. LOFTIS | 3624 | |
|--|---|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence addi | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 26 May 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI | | - | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi real (with appeal fee) in compliance | Appeal. To avoid aban t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Arno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | r). | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | te extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL | Page 2 11 07 OFD 44 07 11 11 11 11 | egant i godina e anno ancelo | - C (- (C |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b | out prior to the date of filing a brief, | will not be entered be | cause |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor | | | |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | | | |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or | er form for appeal by materially red | ducing or simplifying th | ne issues for |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | |
| 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): rejections under 35 USC 101. | | | • |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, | timely filed amendmen | t canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | l be entered and an ex | planation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-25</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attache | ed. |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | does NOT place the application ir | condition for allowand | ce because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| | | | |
| /Bradley B Bayat/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3624 | | | |
| | | | |

Application No.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues the references do not teach the non-purchaser who is other than a current customer and past purchaser. Examiner asserts that this limitation is not supported by the specification. Any negative limitation or exclusionary provision must have basis in the original disclosure. If alternative elements are positively recited in the specification, they may be explicitly excluded in the claims. See In re Johnson, 558 F.2d 1008, 1019, 194 USPQ 187, 196 (CCPA 1977) ("[the] specification, having described the whole, necessarily described the part remaining."). See also Ex parte Grasselli, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983), aff 'd mem., 738 F.2d 453 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The mere absence of a positive recitation is not basis for an exclusion. MPEP 2173.05(i).